

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1, 4, 9, 12, 17, and 20 have been amended. Support for the amendments is provided in Figs. 5 and 6 and the specification on page 18, line 13, through page 20, line 6.

Claims 1-24 were rejected, presumably under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Cartsonis et al. (US 6,584,501) in view of Ludwig et al. (US 6,351,762). To the extent the rejections may be deemed applicable to the amended claims, Applicants respectfully traverse based on the points set forth below.

Claim 1 now defines a network monitoring system that monitors a network in which action explanation information for explaining an individual action is divided into a plurality of packets. One example of such a network is a network employing a server message block (SMB) protocol (see Fig. 3 and specification page 2, line 17, through page 3, line 3). The combined teachings of Cartsonis and Ludwig are not applicable to a network employing an SMB protocol.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Cartsonis and Ludwig, considered individually or in combination, do not render obvious the subject matter now defined by claim 1. Independent claims 9 and 17 now similarly recite the above-mentioned feature distinguishing apparatus claim 1 from Cartsonis and Ludwig, but with respect to a method in the case of claim 9 and a program stored on a computer readable medium in the case of claim 17. Therefore, allowance of claims 1, 9, and 17 and all claims dependent therefrom is warranted.

Claims 4, 12, and 20 recite that the plurality of packets conveying the action explanation information for an individual action include a connection packet, an authentication packet, an

object specification packet, a command packet, and a data packet. Cartsonis and Ludwig do not suggest this combination of features. Therefore, allowance of claims 4, 12, and 20 is warranted for this independent reason.

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

If any issues remain which may best be resolved through a telephone communication, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at the local Washington, D.C. telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/James Edward Ledbetter/

Date: February 15, 2008
JEL/DWW/att

James E. Ledbetter
Registration No. 28,732

Attorney Docket No. 008612-03103
Dickinson Wright PLLC
1901 L Street, NW, Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036
Telephone: (202) 659-6963
Facsimile: (202) 659-1559